

REMARKS

In the Office Action of August 10, 2005, the Examiner indicated that the Remarks in the response filed by the applicant on May 25, 2005 are non-responsive, since they are not in accordance with requirements of 37 CFR 1.111. Moreover, the Examiner also indicated that the added claims have broader scope than the original claims. For example, the Examiner states that claim 12 which, unlike its predecessor former claim 1, does not include a limitation describing an exact connection of the MOSFET to the SCS element.

The previously added independent claim 12 is directed to the embodiments shown in Figs. 2 and 3. The previously added independent claim 21 is directed to the embodiments shown in Figs. 4 and 5. The previously added independent claim 28 is directed to the embodiment shown in Fig. 6.

The added claim 12 includes all limitations of the originally filed claims 1, 2 and 7. Therefore, claim 12 does not have a broader scope than original claim 1. The reason for incorporating claim 7 to claim 1 is that the Examiner has indicated that claim 7 contains allowable subject matter. Therefore, the applicant recites that the MOSFET has a drain, a source and a gate in claim 12 in the previous response. Furthermore, claim 12 also recites that the drain and the source of the MOSFET are respectively connected to the SCS and the ground terminal, and the gate of the MOSFET is coupled to a transistor control circuit.

The added claim 21 also clearly recites the MOSFET has a drain, a source and a gate, wherein the drain and the source of the MOSFET are respectively connected to the positive power supply node and the SCS, and the gate of the MOSFET is coupled to a transistor control circuit.

The added claim 29 clearly recites that MOSFET has a drain, a source and a gate, wherein

the drain and the source of the MOSFET are respectively connected to the SCS and the ground terminal, and the gate of the MOSFET is coupled to a transistor control circuit.

Although claims 12, 21 and 29 do not comprise the limitation of the original claim 6, the applicant believes that these claims should be allowable since each of these independent claims clearly recites the connection of the MOSFET to the SCS element, and such a recitation was not found in the cited prior art.

In the amendment, the present invention is better defined to have distinct features over the references relied upon by the Examiner. As a result of the foregoing, applicant submits that claims 12-29 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels would best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

No fee is believed to be due. However, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

Dated: September 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

William E. Pelton, Esq.
Reg. No. 25,702
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 278-0400
Attorneys for Applicants